



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,156	10/28/2003	Paramjit Kahlon	OIC0097US	6587
60/975 7590 03/23/2011 CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP 11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE BLDG. H, SUITE 250 AUSTIN, TX 78758				
EXAMINER				
OBEID, FAHD A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3627				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/23/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/696,156

Applicant(s)

KAHLON ET AL.

Examiner

FAHD A. OBEID

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 33-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 33-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/24/2011 has been entered.

Preliminary Remarks

2. This is in reply to communication filed on 01/24/2011.
3. Claims 25-32 have been cancelled.
4. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 33, and 34 have been amended.
5. Claims 35 and 36 have been added.
6. Claims 1-24 and 33-36 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-24 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman (US 5,708,828) in view of Balgeman (US 5,446,880), and further in view of Katz (US 2002/0178077).

5. Regarding Claims 1-3, 9-11, and 33-36: Coleman discloses a computer implemented method comprising:

- synchronizing existing target information with source information, wherein the existing target information is stored in a target inventory location record at a target system, the source information is stored at a plurality of source systems, the plurality of source

systems are ones of a plurality of computer systems, the target system is another of the plurality of computer systems, (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

The synchronizing comprises:

- extracting the source information from a plurality of source records (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13),
- at least one of the plurality of source location records is extracted from a first source system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13),
- at least one of the plurality of source location records is extracted from a second source system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13),
- the source information from each of the plurality of source records is in one of a plurality of source formats, and each one of the plurality of source formats corresponds to at least one of the plurality of source systems (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);
- generating intermediate source location information by converting the source location information into an intermediate format (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);
- converting the intermediate source information into target location information, wherein the target location information is in a target format, and the target format corresponds to the target system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

Coleman does not explicitly teach determining whether a target location record exists at a target system, if the target location record exists at the target system, updating the target location record with the target location information, if the target location record does not exist at the target

system, creating the target location record at the target system and storing the target location information in the target location record.

However, Balgeman does disclose the following:

- (claims 34 & 36) determining whether a target location record exists at a target system, if the target location record exists at the target system, updating the target location record with the target location information, if the target location record does not exist at the target system, creating the target location record at the target system and storing the target location information in the target location record (C8 L54-60, claims 3, 6, 7, & 9);

While, Katz does teaches inventory location information (§¶ 39, 42)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Balgeman's and Katz's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, for the advantage of minimizing inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry. Also, for the advantage of providing a communication system which provides flexibility by allowing individual nodes to utilize different databases and which automatically updates corresponding records at different databases with a minimum of burden on the users (Balgeman; C1 L66-67, C2 L1-2).

6. Regarding Claims 4 and 12: Coleman discloses a method of claim 1, wherein from the at least one of the plurality of source location records, the extracting extracts less than all first source location information, and from the at least one of the plurality of source location records

from the second source system, the extracting extracts less than all second source location information (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).

7. Regarding Claims 6, 20, and 21: Coleman discloses a method of claim 5, wherein each of the plurality of address elements comprises: an address identifier element; an address base data element, wherein the address data cleansing data element includes a disable cleansing flag element; an address data cleansing data element; an address relationship data element; and an address custom data element (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).
8. Regarding Claims 7 and 22: Coleman discloses a method of claim 6, wherein the address relationship data element comprises: an address effective end date element; an address occupancy type code element; an address effective start date element; an address type code element; and an address list of roles element (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).
9. Regarding Claims 5, 8, 13-19, and 23-24: Coleman substantially discloses the claimed invention. However, Coleman does not appear to explicitly teach hierarchy of data elements includes a plurality of inventory location elements,
- However, Katz disclose a method of claim 4, wherein the hierarchy of data elements includes a plurality of inventory location elements, wherein each of the plurality of inventory location elements includes: an identifier for identifying the inventory location element; a base data element for defining: a location description; a location name; and a location type code; a list of addresses element for defining a plurality of address elements from a party class; a list of

related business units elements for defining a plurality of business units associated with the inventory, and wherein each of the plurality of business units associated with the inventory includes an identifier element; a list of related inventory locations for defining a plurality of related inventory locations; and a custom data element for defining customized attributes for the inventory (¶¶ 39, 42, 43, 46, 54).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Katz's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, for the advantage of minimizing inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular the applicant argues that: a) the cited references fail to disclose "extracting source inventory location information from a plurality of source inventory location records, where at least one of the plurality of source inventory location records is from a first source system and at least one of the plurality of source inventory location records is from a second source system".

In response to a) examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Coleman teaches a data conversion system and method which converts data between different software and hardware platforms. A data conversion language/engine (DCLE) which converts data from any number o different type or formats from any of various platforms to a single common data standard having a predefined

generic data type, and the data is then converted from this generic type to a new desired format or type and stored on an existing or new destination platform (abstract & fig.2B & C7 L45-53). The DCLE system offers true multi-platform design capabilities, allowing conversion of legacy mainframe data to any modern relational database management system (RDBMS), or from any RDBMS to any mainframe platforms, or custom application can be connected to the platform of choice. The DCLE may also be used to convert data to a non-platform basis for data warehouse usage. Batch automation allows for hands-free data conversion on a nightly, weekly, or yearly basis which is perfectly suited for data warehousing (C7 L1-14).

Therefore, the combination of the cited references still meet the scope of the limitations as currently claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FAHD A. OBEID whose telephone number is (571)270-3324. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fahd A Obeid/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627
March 20, 2011